



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,309	12/21/2001	Flora P. Goldthwaite	MSFT-0741/188840.1	6541

41505 7590 05/05/2005

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/032,309

Applicant(s)

GOLDTHWAITE ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 1/21/05.
2. Claims 1-44 are pending in this application; and, claims 1, 17 and 32 are independent claims. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-18, 21, 22, 25-33, 36, 37 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moran et al. ("Moran").

As per claim 1, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, comprising selecting a time period of interest on the timeline (fig. 17; section [0232]; *selection via indicator 1703*) and displaying from the user's digital history store on the timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interests, wherein each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon associated therewith (figs. 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0113], [0198], [0201], [2020], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *displaying a timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period selected wherein the icon may be in the form of a thumbnail*).

As per claim 2, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including displaying in a navigation region a root

navigation region displaying icons for events, people, places and things (figs. 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0198], [2020], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *root navigation regions such as 1400, 1601 and 1701*) and in response to selecting one of the events, people, places and things icons in the root navigation region, displaying a cluster of one of events, people, places and things corresponding to the selection and relating to the time period of interest (fig. 16; section [0229]; *upon selection of one of the icons in the root navigation region, the timeline interface is updated to show all event related to the selection*).

As per claim 5, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including in response to selecting one of the elements of the cluster, displaying a sub-cluster of elements of which the cluster is comprised, wherein the sub-cluster of elements relate to the time period of interest ((fig. 16; section [0229])).

As per claim 6, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein selecting in the navigating region includes displaying in a path display portion a currently navigated path by the user from root region to individual elements, including intervening selected clusters (section [0186]).

As per claim 9, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes inputting user preference information for pre-specified aspects of said displaying (sections [0204] and [0229]).

As per claim 10, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including in response to a user selection, displaying additional information about the displayed icons (fig. 16; section [0229]).

As per claim 11, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein the time period of interest is selected from one of a range of at least one hour, a range of at least one day, a range of at least one week, a range of at least one month and a range of at least one year (figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

As per claims 12 and 13, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said selecting a time period of interest includes scoping to a time period of interest with a scoping mechanism and wherein the scoping mechanism is a scroll bar (figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

Claims 14-17 and 30-32 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 33 are individually similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21 and 36 are individually similar in scope to claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 22 and 37 are individually similar in scope to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 25 and 40 are individually similar in scope to claim 9 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 26 and 41 are individually similar in scope to claim 10 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 27 and 42 are individually similar in scope to claim 11 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 28 and 29, in combination, is similar in scope to the combination of claims 12 and 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 43 and 44, in combination, is similar in scope to the combination of claims 12 and 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 3, 4, 19, 20, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella").

As per claim 3, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship (sections [0202], [0235] and [0243]), Moran does not explicitly disclose the relationship being one of (1) recency of activity associated therewith, (2) frequency of activity associated therewith and (3) user preferences. Sciammarella teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity associated therewith (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include

Sciammarella's teaching of placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity to Moran's teaching of placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship so that a temporal relationship among the elements would be clearly visible to a viewer.

As per claim 4, the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said placing emphasis includes at least one of changing the size of the icon, changing a contrast associated with the icon and positioning the icon according to a direction of emphasis (Sciammarella: figs. 1-3).

Claims 19 and 34 are individually similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20 and 35 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 7, 23 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Fernandes.

As per claim 7, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes a drag-and-drop operation, i.e. dragging an element from one region to another, and filtering elements displayed in the timeline according to user selection (figs. 11, 13, 14 and 16-20; section [0047]), Moran does not explicitly disclose dragging an element from the navigation region to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element. Fernandes teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store

on a timeline, including dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element (fig. 3; col. 12, lines 7-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fernandes' teaching of dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element to Moran's teaching of dragging an element from one region to another and filtering elements displayed in the timeline according to user selection in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

Claims 23 and 38 are individually similar in scope to claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 8, 24 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran").

As per claim 8, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes providing input for querying a database and in response to the input, filtering the elements displayed in the timeline (section [0128]), Moran does not explicitly disclose inputting text to a query input portion. Official Notice is taken that inputting text to a query input portion to extract data is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include inputting text to a query input portion to extract data to Moran's teaching of providing input for querying a database and in response to the input, filtering the elements displayed in order to provide users with an alternative or additional input means.

Claims 24 and 39 are individually similar in scope to claim 8 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

Moran cannot be considered to teach or suggest displaying elements associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interest on the timeline.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Moran does teach a timeline (figs. 11 and 13) associated with events (sections [0047], [0141], [0198] and [0232]; *e.g. meetings*), people (section [0204]; figs. 13 and 14; *e.g. Betty, Adam, Charlie*), places (section [0113]; fig. 14; *e.g. virtual meeting place/chat room*) and things (section [0201]; fig. 13; *e.g. computers 1404 and 1405*) as claimed in claims 1, 17 and 32.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquires

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4068. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
May 2, 2005

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100